Oey, Jan

From: Tricker, Anthony
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2002 11:54 AM
To: Kinser, Robin D.; Oey, Jan
Cc: Nelson, Bettie L; Sanders, Edward; Tricker, Anthony
Subject: RE: Abstract

I think Ted has the best solution. Maybe the conclusions should read "*Based on additional statistical and analytical measures of intra- and interindividual variability, both CO in exhalate and COHb measurements can discriminate between smokers of 3.0-6.9 mg tar yield cigarettes and non-smokers. For large-scale population studies, COHb measurement provides an acceptable measure of CO exposure.*" Although these results add little new information to the published literature, they would provide written documentation to justify using COHb rather than CO in exhalate measurements in future exposure studies. I would try and avoid using the term "Ultra Light brands" since this certainly does not apply to cigarette markets outside the US.

Best regards,
Tony

-----Original Message-----
From: Kinser, Robin D.
Sent: 31 janvier 2002 17:35
To: Oey, Jan; Tricker, Anthony
Cc: Kinser, Robin D.; Nelson, Bettie L
Subject: RE: Abstract

I can live with the smoker/non-smokers discrimination for that tar-yield category. I don't think that that is new. I still think s a comment about COHb vs. CO is in order.

Robin

-----Original Message-----
From: Oey, Jan
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2002 11:32 AM
To: Kinser, Robin D.; Tricker, Anthony
Subject: Abstract

Robin and Tony,

I'm fine w/ the method description. I believe the main issue is the conclusion. Roger would like to add the additional information which we at this point have not yet evaluated (e.g., week to week variation, number of cigarettes) but should be presented in the poster. He indicated that without these data, there is nothing new. Don thinks the same. I think Ted's suggestion could be the solution: something new here is that smokers of Ultra Light Brands can be discrimated from non-smokers.

Jan

PM3006639399

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/gmcj0001